arXiv:1601.03033v2 [math.AG] 31 Aug 2016

POINTS OF BOUNDED HEIGHT ON OSCILLATORY SETS

GEORGES COMTE AND CHRIS MILLER

Abstract. We show that transcendental curves in $\mathbb{R}^n$ (not necessarily compact) have few rational points of bounded height provided that the curves are well behaved with respect to algebraic sets in a certain sense and can be parametrized by functions belonging to a specified algebra of infinitely differentiable functions. Examples of such curves include logarithmic spirals and solutions to Euler equations $x^2y''+xy'+cy=0$ with $c>0$.

1. Introduction

The **height** of $(a_1/b_1,\dots,a_n/b_n)\in\mathbb{Q}^n$ is by definition $\max\{|a_i|,|b_i| : i=0,\cdots,n\}$, when each pair $(a_i,b_i)\in\mathbb{Z}^2$ is coprime. For $X\subseteq\mathbb{R}^n$ and $T\geq 0$, let $\#X(\mathbb{Q},T)$ be the number of points in $X\cap\mathbb{Q}^n$ of height at most T.

The overarching question: What is the asymptotic behaviour of $\#X(\mathbb{Q},T)$ as $T\to+\infty$? As it can be notoriously difficult to determine whether X has any rational points at all, emphasis tends to be on the establishment of upper bounds. For convenience in exposition, we put

$$\rho(X)=\varlimsup_{T\to+\infty}\frac{\log(\max\{1,\#X(\mathbb{Q},T)\})}{\log\log T}\in[0,+\infty]$$

and say that X has finite order if $\rho(X)<\infty$.

There is a natural split between the cases X algebraic and X transcendental; we are concerned with the latter. Indeed, in the algebraic case, usually the asymptotic of $\#X(\mathbb{Q},T)$ is polynomial (see for instance Browning, Heath-Brown and Salberger [9]). On the opposite, one knows since Bombieri and Pila [6] that for the graph Γ_f of a transcendental analytic function on a compact interval of $\mathbb{R}$, the asymptotic of $\#\Gamma_f(\mathbb{Q},T)$ is sub-polynomial, that is

$$\lim_{T\to+\infty}\log(\max\{1,\#\Gamma_f(\mathbb{Q},T)\})/\log T=0,$$

a result known to be sharp (see Pila [26], or Surroca [31], [32]). The sub-polynomial asymptotic obtained in [6] for graphs of analytic transcendental functions on compact intervals has been generalized by Pila and Wilkie in [29] to all sets definable in any o-minimal structure over the real field (see van den Dries' book [14] for the definition and properties of o-minimal structures). Since then several results and conjectures even assert that $\rho(X)<+\infty$ for sets X of specific dimension or for any set X in

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 11G50; Secondary 03C64.

This work was initiated while the authors were in residence at the Mathematical Sciences Research Institute (Berkeley) during the Model Theory, Arithmetic Geometry and Number Theory program (January 20, 2014 to May 23, 2014). Research by Comte also supported by ANR STAAVF. Research by Miller also supported by Université Savoie Mont Blanc and NSF Grant DMS-1001176.

some specific o-minimal structure (see Binyamini and Novikov [5], Cluckers, Pila and Wilkie [11], Jones, Miller and Thomas [20], Jones and Thomas [21], Pila [25], [27], [28]). In this direction, for more connections to logic, see our last section.

Contrary to those approaches, here we do not restrict to non-oscillatory sets (we mean by this terminology sets definable in some o-minimal structure), but we rather develop some sufficiency conditions for showing that certain kinds of curves in $\mathbb{R}^n$, oscillating or not, have finite order (see also in this spirit earlier results by Besson [3], [4], Boxall and Jones [7], [8], Masser [23]). Throughout the paper we consider for X a parametrized curve. Our main result is technical; a full statement is best postponed (see Theorem 2.20), but we shall give now some examples as motivation.

For $a > 0$, we say that a C^∞ function $g\colon [a, \infty[\to \mathbb{R}$ is **slow** (see Definition 2.2) if there exist nonnegative real numbers A, B, C and D such that, for all $x \geq a$ and $p \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$|\frac{g^{(p)}(x)}{p!}| \leq D(Ap^B \frac{\log^C x}{x})^p.$$

Let us denote by $S([a, +\infty[)$ the set of slow functions (with possible different data A, B, C, D). As observed in Remark 2.6, the set of slow functions is an algebra stable under derivation.

Let $\mathcal{E}$ be the collection of all elementary real functions of one variable, as defined in Khovanskii [22, §1.5], whose domain contains an unbounded-above open interval. All functions in $\mathcal{E}$ are (real-)analytic.

Proposition 1.1. *Let $f, g, s_1, s_2 \in (\mathcal{E} \cap S([a, +\infty[)) \cup \{Id\}$ and f, g belong to the set of functions h satisfying*

$$h = Id \quad or \quad \exists \alpha \geq 0,\ \forall x \geq a, \forall p \geq 0,\ |h^{(p)}(x)| \leq \alpha^p.$$

Let $F, G > 0$, $\ell, q \in \mathbb{N}^*$, and let u, v be real number that are both rational numbers or such that one of them is irrational and is not a U-number of degree $\nu = 1$ in Mahler's classification [1]*. Let x_0 be such that the curve*

$$X := \{\big(u + e^{-Fx} f(s_1(x^\ell)), v + e^{-Gx} g(s_2(x^q))\big) : x \geq x_0\}$$

is defined and contains no infinite semialgebraic set. Then X has finite order.

Example 1.2. Examples of such curves are easy to build. For instance the curve given by the parametrization

$$(\log 2 + \frac{\arctan \log^2 x}{x^5(2 + \cos^3 \log x)}, \pi + \frac{\sin \log x}{\sqrt{x}(1 + \log \log x)}),\ x \geq 2$$

has finite order.

An explicit bound of the order ρ may be computed in terms of the complexity of the elementary functions f, g, s_1 and s_2. Thus, for particular choices of f, g, s_1, s_2, after computation of the complexity of these elementary functions, we can get more refined results, such as:

[1] See Baker [1, Chapter 8] for definitions and details.

Proposition 1.3. *Let a_1, a_2, F, G, c_1, c_2 be nonzero real numbers with $F, G > 0$. Let $\ell, q \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and let u, v be like in Proposition 1.1. Then*

$$X := \{\big(u + a_1 e^{Fx}\cos(c_1 x^\ell), v + a_2 e^{Gx}\sin(c_2 x^q)\big) : x \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

has order at most $5 + 4\max\{\ell, q\}$.

As a special case, we have $\rho(\mathbb{S}_\omega) \leq 9$ for every logarithmic spiral

$$\mathbb{S}_\omega := \{\big(e^x\cos(\omega x), e^x\sin(\omega x)\big) : x \in \mathbb{R}\} \quad (\omega \neq 0).$$

Observe that $\mathbb{S}_\omega$ is a maximal (real-time) trajectory of $\dot{z} = (1 + i\omega)z$ and a subgroup of $(\mathbb{C}^*, \cdot\,)$. It is easy to see that $\rho(\mathbb{S}_{\pi/\log 2}) \geq 1$.

We have a related result for functions.

Proposition 1.4. *Let $f, s \in (\mathcal{E} \cap S([a, +\infty[)) \cup \{Id\}$, and ℓ , f like in Proposition 1.1. Then the graph X of $f \circ s \circ \log^\ell$ has finite order. In particular,*

let a and c be nonzero real numbers, $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $f \in \{\sin, \cos\}$. Then the order of the graph X of $af(c\log^\ell)$ is at most $5 + 4\ell$.

With $\ell = 1$, we obtain maximal solutions to the Euler equation $x^2y'' + xy' + c^2y = 0$, indeed, $\{\cos(c\log), \sin(c\log)\}$ is a set of fundamental solutions on $]0, \infty[$. It is easy to see that $\rho \geq 1$ for $c = \pi/\log 2$. The proof generalizes to show that all transcendental slow functions in $\mathcal{E}$ that satisfy certain further technical conditions have finite order (see Proposition 3.8).

To the best of our knowledge, these results yield the first known examples of real-analytic submanifolds (embedded and connected) of the plane having nonzero finite order and whose intersection with some real-algebraic set has infinitely many connected components. (By Lindemann-Weierstrass, $\rho(\sin x) = 0$. It is an easy exercise that $\rho(\sin(\pi x)) = +\infty$.)

Let X be any instance of any of the above results. It follows from work of Pila [25] that every compact subset of X has finite order, but via proof that does not yield finite order for X itself. We remedy this by establishing the existence of compact connected $K_X \subseteq X$ such that $\rho(X \setminus K_X)) < \infty$, thus yielding $\rho(X) = \max(\rho(K_X), \rho(X \setminus K_X)) < +\infty$. The constants witnessing the bounds appearing in [25] depend a priori on the choice of the compact subset of the curve X, and in no case could we conclude in some visibly simple way that the set of all such constants may be bounded as the length of our parametrizing interval goes to infinity. For instance, by [25], every bounded subset of the graph of $\sin \pi x$ has finite order, but again $\sin \pi x$ has infinite order on any unbounded interval. So dealing with the oscillatory case requires tight control of any involved constants appearing in any known methods as the parameter interval we are looking at increases in length. Since we use here the determinant method of [6], as in [29], and since the constants appearing along this method come from bounds on the derivatives of any order of the functions parametrizing the set, we impose some tameness on the derivatives via the algebra of slow functions. This condition may be viewed as the oscillatory and noncompact counterpart of Pila's mild parametrizations; this somewhat answers the wish of [25, 4.3 Remark 3].

Our main statements (Theorem 2.20 and Proposition 3.8) reflect the method and give general explicit bounds for $\#X(\mathbb{Q}, T)$ in a form of a product of two independent

factors, one of this factors coming from the slowness hypothesis, the other one taking into account how much our curve intersects algebraic curves of given degree.

There are non-oscillatory unbounded functions of finite nonzero order; as examples, the function 2^x has order 1 (indeed, the only rational points are $(k, 2^k)$, $k \in \mathbb{Z}$), and the restriction to the positive real line of the Euler gamma function Γ has order at most 2 (see [8]) and at least 1 (consider the values at positive integers and recall Stirling's formula). The restriction to $]1, \infty[$ of the Riemann zeta function ζ has order at most 2 (again see [8]), but it is not known if the order is positive. Our methods are not confined to the oscillatory case; for illustrative purposes, we shall give alternate proofs of the finiteness of the orders of Γ and ζ (see Sections 3.13.1 and 3.15.1), though our bounds will not be as good as those already known.

2. Counting rational points on curves.

For $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ and $T \geq 0$, we let $X(\mathbb{Q}, T)$ denote the set of rational points in X with height $\leq T$. Let $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be a parameterized curve, that is, the image of n smooth functions $\gamma = (f_1, \cdots, f_n) \colon I \to \mathbb{R}^n$, for I an interval in $\mathbb{R}$, such that $\gamma(I) = \Gamma$.

The goal of this section is to provide, under some hypothesis on the derivatives of the f_i, a bound for $\#\Gamma(\mathbb{Q}, T)$. Evidently, it is equivalent to provide such a bound on the projection of Γ onto some coordinate plane of $\mathbb{R}^n$, from now on, we can assume without loss of generality that our forthcoming assumptions on the f_i concern only two coordinate functions among the f_i, or more conveniently, that $n = 2$. Therefore, in the sequel we denote $\gamma = (f, g)$ a parametrization of a given curve $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$.

For $N, L \in \mathbb{R}^*$ and some interval $J \subset \mathbb{R}$, we set

$$\Gamma_{N,L} := \gamma([N, N + L])$$
$$\Gamma_{N,+\infty} := \gamma([N, +\infty[,$$
$$\Gamma_J := \gamma(J).$$

Lemma 2.1. *Fix $\mu \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Let I be an interval of length L. Let $x_1, \ldots, x_\mu$ be points in I and $\psi_1, \cdots, \psi_\mu$ be $C^{\mu-1}$-functions from I to $\mathbb{R}$. Set*

$$\Delta = \det(\psi_i(x_j)).$$

Then

$$|\Delta| \leq L^{\frac{\mu(\mu-1)}{2}} \sum_{s \in S(0,\cdots,\mu-1)} \sigma_{1,s(0)}\sigma_{2,s(1)} \cdots \sigma_{\mu,s(\mu-1)}.$$

where $S(0, \cdots, \mu-1)$ is the permutation group of $\{0, \cdots, \mu-1\}$ and

$$\sigma_{i,p} = \sup_{\xi \in I} \frac{1}{p!} |\psi_i^{(p)}(\xi)|, \ p \in \{0, \cdots, \mu-1\}.$$

Proof. We use the classical by now bound for $|\Delta|$ (see [6, Proposition 2], [25]).

$$|\Delta| \leq |V(x_1, \cdots, x_\mu)| \cdot |\det\Big(\frac{\psi_j^{(i-1)}(\xi_{ij})}{(i-1)!}\Big)_{i,j=1,\cdots,\mu}|,$$

where V is the Vandermonde determinant and ξ_{ij} are points in I. The statement follows.

□

In order to bound from above the determinant Δ we consider from now on a specific bound condition on the derivatives of our parametrization γ. This condition will allow for control of the maximal length L of a parameter interval $[x, x+L]$ such that $\Gamma_{x,L}(\mathbb{Q}, T)$ is contained in a single algebraic curve of given degree d (see Proposition 2.13) and thus to eventually control the number of such algebraic curves needed to cover $\Gamma(\mathbb{Q}, T)$ (see Proposition 2.17).

Definition 2.2. Let $a > 1$. We say that the smooth parametrization

$$\gamma = (f, g) \colon [a, +\infty[\to \mathbb{R}^2$$

of a bounded curve Γ is a **slow parametrization** of Γ (with data A, B, C, u and b) when

(1) there exists $u \in \mathbb{R}$ and $b : [a, +\infty[\to \mathbb{R}_+$ decreasing to zero, such that for all $x \geq a$,
$$|f(x) - u| \leq b(x),$$
(2) there exist nonnegative real numbers A, B, C such that for all $p \geq 0$ and $x \geq a$
$$|\frac{f^{(p)}(x)}{p!}| \leq \varphi_p(x), \ |\frac{g^{(p)}(x)}{p!}| \leq \varphi_p(x),$$
where
$$\varphi_p(x) = \Big(Ap^B \frac{\log^C x}{x}\Big)^p.$$

We call a function satisfying condition (2) above a **slow function**. We will say that the set of constants A, B, C is **attached** to such a slow function, or attached to the slow parametrization γ.

Remark 2.3. In full generality one should rather define φ_p as

$$\varphi_p(x) = D\Big(Ap^B \frac{\log^C x}{x}\Big)^p, \tag{2.3.1}$$

for some real number D, like in the introduction, in particular in order to have stability by addition for the set of slow functions, as pointed out in Remark 2.6. But the condition $f \leq 1, g \leq 1$, made for simplicity in forthcoming computations, is made without loss of generality, up to dividing f and g by an integer bounding f and g, which is harmless for counting rational points.

Remark 2.4. In our Definition 2.2 the first coordinate f of a slow parametrization γ goes to u as the parameter goes to infinity, at speed at least b. In the sequel for applications we will often consider the case $b(x) = 1/x^E$, with $E > 0$, and concerning u, its Diophantine properties have to be considered for counting rational points on Γ (see Remark 2.15 (4)).

Remark 2.5. Note that in case a function k (bounded from above or not) is bigger than 1 and satisfies condition (2) of Definition 2.2 for $p \geq 1$, then $1/k$ is slow.

Remark 2.6. For $a > 1$, let us denote by $S([a, +\infty[)$ the set of slow functions defined on $[a, +\infty[$ (with the bounding function φ_p as in (2.3.1) and with possible different data A, B, C, D, u, b for each of them). A trivial computation, essentially based on the

formula (2.9.1) given below, shows that $S([a,+\infty[)$ is a subalgebra of $C^\infty([a,+\infty[)$, stable under derivation.

Remark 2.7. For a given slow parametrization, we can always assume that A, B, C are big enough, up to quantitatively weakening the condition of being a slow parametrization. The condition that the parameter has to be bigger than a in this definition is technical. On one hand we are essentially interested in the part of the curve corresponding to a neighbourhood of infinity of the parameter, because this part of the curve is the oscillatory part when the parametrization is analytic. On the other hand, for analytic curves Γ restricted to a compact interval of parameters, since we have a mild parametrization (see [25]), one gets a bound for $\#\Gamma(\mathbb{Q},T)$ as given in Theorem 2.20, depending on how much Γ cuts algebraic curves of given degree, or at least we have a general sub-polynomial bound for $\#\Gamma(\mathbb{Q},T)$, provided by [29] for the o-minimal context.

Remark 2.8. Definition 2.2 may be seen as the unbounded version of the mild parametrization introduced in [25]. For an analytic function $g\colon \mathbb{R}_+ \to \mathbb{R}$, note that to satisfy the bound of Definition 2.2 with $B=0$, implies that one can define a complex analytic continuation of g on the half plane $\{x \in \mathbb{C}, \Re(z) > 0\}$, since the radius of convergence of the Taylor series of g at x is bigger than $\dfrac{x}{A\log^C x}$.

Remark 2.9. A slow parametrization may also be thought of as the oscillatory version of Yomdin-Gromov parametrization for o-minimal sets (see Gromov [17], Yomdin [34] and [29]), since a slow parametrization will provide, for fixed T and d, a finite number $n(T)$ of intervals I, such that $\Gamma_I(\mathbb{Q},T)$ is contained in a single algebraic curve of degree d. In the o-minimal case, since the number $n(T)$ given by a Yomdin-Gromov parametrization is not controlled, one cannot expect for $\#\Gamma(\mathbb{Q},T)$ better bounds than $\alpha_\epsilon T^\epsilon$ (for any $\epsilon > 0$). Contrariwise, here, the fast decay on the derivatives imposed by a slow parametrization will provide a sufficiently small number $n(T)$ (Lemma 2.17) that will in turn implies that Γ has finite order, provided good enough Bézout bounds are available (Theorem 2.20). It is worth noting that starting with a given slow parametrization, the constants α and β that will be obtained in our bound $\alpha\log^\beta T$ for $\#\Gamma(\mathbb{Q},T)$ in Theorem 2.20, Propositions 3.5 or 3.8, will explicitly depend on the data A, B, C and b, although the density of rational points in the set Γ should be independent of any choice of parametrization. This obvious constraint theoretically explains why, in practice, the range of slow parametrizations, and reparametrizations that improve the decay of a given slow parametrization or the decay of b, is necessarily limited. When one composes a slow parametrization with a smooth increasing bijection $\sigma\colon [a',+\infty[\to[a,+\infty[$, having smaller and smaller derivatives as x goes to infinity, like $x \mapsto \log x$, one virtually should improve on the decay of the derivatives of the reparametrization. But in the same time, since σ is contracting the distance and since the slow parametrization we started from has smaller and smaller derivatives at x, as x gets bigger and bigger, this effect is automatically counterbalanced. It thus appears that a given slow parametrization is a quite stable and optimal form of parametrization with respect to reparametrization and regarding the issue of counting rational points of bounded height in a curve.

We assume in what follows that $\gamma = (f, g)$ is a slow parametrization of the curve Γ. Now let us choose $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and let us denote $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2) \in \mathbb{N}^2$ by α and the function $f^{\alpha_1} g^{\alpha_2}$ by γ^α.

In the following lemmas, we will use the classical formula

$$\frac{(f^\alpha g^\beta)^{(p)}}{p!} = \sum_{i_1+\cdots i_\alpha + j_1 + \cdots + j_\beta = p} \frac{f^{(i_1)} \cdots f^{(i_\alpha)} g^{(j_1)} \cdots g^{(j_\beta)}}{i_1! \cdots i_\alpha! j_1! \cdots j_\beta!}, \tag{2.9.1}$$

standing for $\alpha, \beta, p \in \mathbb{N}$.

Lemma 2.10. *Let γ be a slow parametrization of a plane curve Γ, with constants A, B, C. Then for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^2$, $\gamma^\alpha \in S([a, +\infty[)$. More precisely, for any $p \in \mathbb{N}$*

$$\frac{|(\gamma^\alpha)^{(p)}(x)\ |}{p!} \leq (p+1)^{\alpha_1+\alpha_2} A^p p^{Bp} \frac{\log^{Cp} x}{x^p}.$$

Proof. Use formula (2.9.1) to obtain

$$\frac{|(\gamma^\alpha)^{(p)}(x)|}{p!} \leq \sum_{i_1+\cdots i_{\alpha_1} + j_1 + \cdots + j_{\alpha_2} = p} A^p {i_1}^{Bi_1} \cdots {i_{\alpha_1}}^{Bi_{\alpha_1}} {j_1}^{Bj_1} \cdots {j_{\alpha_2}}^{Bj_{\alpha_2}} \frac{\log^{Cp} x}{x^p}$$

$$\leq (p+1)^{\alpha_1+\alpha_2} A^p p^{Bp} \frac{\log^{Cp} x}{x^p}.$$

□

We now recall another bound that will be used in the proof of Proposition 2.12.

Lemma 2.11. *For any $\mu \geq 1$, for any $B > 0$,*

$$\prod_{r=0}^{\mu-1} r^{Br} \leq \mu^{B\frac{\mu(\mu-1)}{2}}.$$

Proof. We use the classical bound for such a product (see also [25, Proposition 2.2]). We have

$$\log\Big(\prod_{r=0}^{\mu-1} r^{Br}\Big) = B \sum_{r=1}^{\mu-1} r \log r \leq B \int_1^\mu t \log t \ dt$$

$$\leq B \frac{\mu(\mu-1)\log\mu}{2}.$$

□

Let us now fix some integer $d \geq 1$ and set

$$\mu = \frac{(d+2)(d+1)}{2} = \#\{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^2 : |\alpha| \leq d\}, \quad \rho = \frac{\mu(\mu-1)}{2},$$

and for μ points $x_1, \cdots, x_\mu$ given in the domain of definition of γ, consider the determinant

$$\Delta = \det(\gamma^\alpha(x_j))_{\alpha \in \Delta_2(d), j \in \{1, \cdots, \mu\}}.$$

Proposition 2.12. *Let γ be a slow parametrization of a plane curve Γ. With the above notation, for any $d \geq 1$ there exist $N = N(C) \geq 1$ and $C(d, A, B) > 0$ such that, for any $L > 0$, for any $x_1, \cdots, x_\mu \in [N; N + L]$*

$$|\Delta| \leq C(d, A, B) L^\rho \frac{\log^{C\rho} N}{N^\rho}.$$

Furthermore, one can take $C(d, A, B) = \mu! A^\rho \mu^{d(\mu-1)} \mu^{B\rho}$.

Proof. Let us first note that for any $p = 0, \cdots, \mu - 1$, $\log^{Cp} x / x^p$ is decreasing on $[N, +\infty[$ with, for instance $N = N(C) = e^C$. Combining Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.10 and these two remarks, one obtains for $x_1, \cdots, x_\mu \in [N, N + L]$

$$|\Delta| \leq L^{\frac{\mu(\mu-1)}{2}} \sum_{s \in S(0,\cdots,\mu-1)} A^{\sum_{j=0}^{\mu-1} j} \prod_{r=0}^{\mu-1} r^{Br} \prod_{r=0}^{\mu-1} (r+1)^d \frac{\log^{C \sum_{j=0}^{\mu-1} j} N}{N^{\sum_{j=0}^{\mu-1} j}}.$$

$$\leq A^\rho \mu^{d(\mu-1)} L^\rho \frac{\log^{C\rho} N}{N^\rho} \sum_{s \in S(0,\cdots,\mu-1)} \prod_{r=0}^{\mu-1} r^{Br}.$$

Now using Lemma 2.11, we have

$$|\Delta| \leq \mu! A^\rho \mu^{d(\mu-1)} \mu^{B\rho} L^\rho \frac{\log^{C\rho} N}{N^\rho}. \qquad \square$$

Let us now fix $T \geq 1$ and assume that the points $x_1, \cdots, x_\mu \in [N, N + L]$, with the notation of Proposition 2.12, are such that $(f(x_j), g(x_j))$, $j = 1, \cdots, \mu$, is a pair of rational points of height $\leq T$. In this case, if $\Delta \neq 0$ we have,

$$|\Delta| \prod_{j=1,\cdots,\mu} |a_j^d b_j^d| \geq 1,$$

where a_j and b_j are the denominator of $f(x_j)$ and $g(x_j)$. But since

$$\prod_{j=1,\cdots,\mu} |a_j^d b_j^d| \leq T^{2d\mu},$$

we also have, again if $\Delta \neq 0$,

$$T^{2d\mu} |\Delta| \geq 1.$$

Now, considering Proposition 2.12, as soon as

$$T^{2d\mu} C(d, A, B) L^\rho \frac{\log^{C\rho} N}{N^\rho} < 1 \tag{2.12.1}$$

we necessarily have $\Delta = 0$. Let us fix L as

$$L := L(d, A, B, T, N) = C'(d, A, B) \frac{N}{\log^C N} T^{\frac{-4d}{\mu-1}}, \tag{2.12.2}$$

with $C'(d, A, B) = C(d, A, B)^{\frac{-1}{\rho}}$. It follows that for any interval $[N; N + L[$, with $N \geq N(C)$ given by Proposition 2.12, and L given by equation (2.12.2), for any choice of points $x_1, \cdots, x_\mu \in [N; N + L[$ and such that $\gamma(x_j) \in \Gamma_{N,L}(\mathbb{Q}, T)$, the rank of $(\gamma^\alpha(x_j))_{\alpha \in \Delta_2(d), j=1,\cdots,\mu,}$ is $\leq \mu - 1$.

We now proceed similarly to Lemma 1 of [6]. Let a be the maximal rank of $(\gamma^\alpha(x_j))$ over all $x_1, \cdots, x_\mu \in [N; N + L[$ such that $\gamma(x_j) \in \Gamma_{N,L}(\mathbb{Q}, T)$ and let

$M = (\gamma^\alpha(x_j))_{\alpha\in I, j\in\{1,\cdots,a\}}$ be of rank a, for some fixed $x_1, \cdots, x_a \in [N; N+L[$ such that $\gamma(x_j) \in \Gamma_{N,L}(\mathbb{Q}, T)$ and some $I \subset \{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^2, |\alpha| \leq d\}$ of cardinality a. Since $a < \mu$, we can choose $\beta = (\beta_1, \beta_2) \in \Delta_2(d) \setminus I$.

Let us denote by $f(y) \in \mathbb{R}[y]$ the determinant of the matrix

$$(M' y^\delta)_{\delta\in I\cup\{\beta\}},$$

where $y = (y_1, y_2)$, $y^\delta = y_1^{\delta_1} y_2^{\delta_2}$, and M' is M augmented by the line $\gamma^\beta(x_j)_{j\in\{1,\cdots,a\}}$. Then $f(y)$ is a polynomial with real coefficients that is not zero, since the coefficient of the monomial y^β in $f(y)$ is the non zero minor $\det(M)$, and the degree of $f(y)$ is at most d. Furthermore for any $(x_1, x_2) \in \Gamma_{N,L}(\mathbb{Q}, T)$ we have $f(x_1, x_2) = 0$, by definition of the maximal rank a.

Note that in case there are fewer than μ points x in $[N, N+L]$ such that $\gamma(x) \in \Gamma_{N,L}(\mathbb{Q}, T)$, those points $\gamma(x)$ are certainly in some algebraic curve of degree less than d, since the dimension of the space of polynomials of $\mathbb{R}[y]$ of degree at most d is μ.

To sum up this discussion, we have proved the following statement.

Proposition 2.13. *Let γ be a slow parametrization of a plane curve Γ. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $T \geq 1$. There exists $N(C) \geq 1$ such that for any $N \geq N(C)$ exists $L = L(d, A, B, T, N)$, such that the set $\Gamma_{N,L}(\mathbb{Q}, T)$ is contained in an algebraic curve of $\mathbb{R}^2$ of degree at most d. Furthermore one can take $L = C'(d, A, B)\frac{N}{\log^C N} T^{-\nu}$, with $\nu = \frac{4d}{\mu-1}$ and $C'(d, A, B) = A^{-1}\mu^{-B}\mu^{\frac{-2d}{\mu}}(\mu!)^{\frac{-2}{\mu(\mu-1)}}$.*

So far, we have introduced the notion of slow parametrization and given bounds for such parametrization, like in Proposition 2.13. This is in order to eventually bound the number of rational points of bounded height in the range $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ of the slow parametrization we consider. At this point, one may have the naive idea that the slower this parametrization is (that is the smaller A, B and C are), the better this bound should be, since the slower our parametrization is, the larger the length L provided by Proposition 2.13 is, and thus the smaller the number $n(T)$ of intervals I such that $\Gamma_I(\mathbb{Q}, T)$ is contained in one algebraic curve of given degree is. But of course the density in Γ of rational points of given height does not depend on the parametrization of Γ, that maybe could be taken slower than it is, up to a convenient reparametrization of the half line by itself. There is no contradiction here. In fact such a reparametrization also increases the time needed to parametrize the rational points of height less then T, and this growth balances the gain obtained on the bounds of the derivatives after reparametrization.

Nevertheless, we believe that this balancing effect must be made visible in our final bound, with the hope that one can, in a particular situation, optimize this balance. For this goal one introduces a control of the speed at which a slow parametrization, or a suitable change of variables made to obtain a slower parametrization, runs through the rational points of given bounded height. On the other hand, so far, we have not mentioned that in order to obtain a bound on $\#\Gamma(\mathbb{Q}, T)$ from assumptions on a parametrization of Γ, one has to exclude some noninjective behaviour of the parametrization under consideration: passing too many times by the same rational point leaves no possibility to bound $\#\Gamma(\mathbb{Q}, T)$ throughout a parametrization. The next definition proposes such a notion of quantitative control on the time needed to

go through all the points of given bounded height as well providing a quantitative control of, let us say, the noninjectivity of our parametrization. The better is this control, called a height control function, the better will be our final bounds. It is thus worth considering as a separate additional assumption such a control function and state our bounds in terms of this given height control function.

Definition 2.14. Let $\gamma\colon [a,+\infty[\to\mathbb{R}^2$ be a parametrization of a plane curve Γ. We say that a function $\varphi\colon [a,+\infty[\to\mathbb{R}$ is a **height control function of** γ if, for all $T\geq 1$,

$$\gamma^{-1}(\Gamma(\mathbb{Q},T))\subset[a,\varphi(T)].$$

Remark 2.15. In the following particular cases, one can easily compute a height control function of $\gamma=(f,g)$. The preliminary observation is useful: for $a,p\in\mathbb{Q}$, $b,q\in\mathbb{Q}^*$, $a/b-p/q=0$ or $|a/b-p/q|\geq K/|q|$, for $K=1/|b|$.

(1) In case that f and g are decreasing respectively to $u,v\in\mathbb{Q}$, a height control function of γ is given by $\varphi(T)=\min(f^{-1}(\frac{K}{T}),g^{-1}(\frac{K}{T}))$, for some $K>0$.
(2) If $u,v\in\mathbb{Q}$ and $|f-u|$ and $|g-v|$ are respectively bounded from above by functions b and c that decrease to 0, a height control function of γ is given by $\varphi(T)=\max(b^{-1}(\frac{K}{T}),c^{-1}(\frac{K}{T}))$, for some $K>0$, as soon as $f-u$ and $g-v$ have no common zero on $[a,+\infty[$ (note that contrariwise to (1), in this case the functions $f-u$ or $g-v$ may have zeroes between $\min(b^{-1}(\frac{K}{T}),c^{-1}(\frac{K}{T}))$ and $\max(b^{-1}(\frac{K}{T}),c^{-1}(\frac{K}{T})))$.
(3) In case $u\in\mathbb{Q}$, any decreasing function $b\colon [a,+\infty[\to\mathbb{R}$ going to 0 and bounding $|f-u|$ gives rise to a height control function of γ defined by $\varphi(T)=b^{-1}(\frac{K}{T})$, for some $K>0$, as soon as f does not take the value u. In particular, when γ is a slow parametrization as in Definition 2.2, with $u\in\mathbb{Q}$ and $b(x)=1/x^E$, $E>0$, one can take $\varphi(T)=T^{\frac{K}{E}}$, for some $K>0$, as soon as f does not take the value u on $[a,+\infty[$.
(4) In case $u\notin\mathbb{Q}$, let us denote by τ a **transcendence measure function** of u, that is a function such for any $p,q\in\mathbb{N}$ with height less than T, $|u-\frac{p}{q}|\geq e^{-\tau(T)}$. When (f,g) is slow, since $|f(x)-u|\leq b(x)$ and b decreases to 0, a height control function of γ is given by $b^{-1}(e^{-\tau(T)})$. For instance by Roth's Theorem [30], in case u is an algebraic number, τ may be $\log\frac{T^3}{C}$, where $C>0$ depends on u. In case $u=\pi$ (by Cijsouw's theorem [10]), or in case $u=\log v$, for v an algebraic number not 0 or 1, τ may be $K\log T$ (see [1, Chapter 3]). In fact $\tau(T)=K\log T$, and thus $\varphi(T)=b^{-1}(1/T^K)$, is possible for any number which is not a U-number of degree $\nu=1$ in Mahler's classification, and almost all numbers being S-numbers, almost all numbers are not U-numbers (see [1, Chapter 8]).

For fixed $T\geq 1, d\in\mathbb{N}^*$ and with the notation introduced in Proposition 2.13, we define a sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ of real numbers by

$$x_0=N(C),\ x_{n+1}=x_n+C'(d,A,B)\frac{x_n}{\log^C x_n}T^{-\nu}.$$

Then $[x_n, x_{n+1}]$ is an interval in $[N(C), +\infty[$ of length

$$L_n = C'(d, A, B)\frac{x_n}{\log^C x_n}T^{-\nu}$$

such that $\Gamma_{x_n, L_n}(\mathbb{Q}, T)$ is contained in one algebraic curve of degree $\leq d$.

Remark 2.16. For γ a slow parametrization of a curve Γ, with height control function φ and for $T \geq 1$ fixed, since the sequence $(x_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ goes to $+\infty$, we can cover the interval $[N(C), \varphi(T)]$, whose image contains the rational points of Γ of height $\leq T$, with a finite number of intervals $[x_n, x_{n+1}]$. An upper bound on this number provides an upper bound for the number of curves of degree $\leq d$ containing $\Gamma_{N(C),+\infty}(\mathbb{Q}, T)$. The following Lemma gives such an upper bound.

Lemma 2.17. *Let γ be a slow parametrization of a plane curve Γ, with height control function φ and let $T \geq 1$ and $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$. We denote by $n(T)$ the lower $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $x_n \geq \varphi(T)$. Then*

$$n(T) \leq \frac{T^\nu \log^{C+1} \varphi(T)}{\log(2)\min(1, C'(d, A, B))} + 1,$$

where $C'(d, A, B)$ and ν are given by Proposition 2.13. In particular, we can cover $[N(C); \varphi(T)]$ with at most

$$\left\lceil \frac{T^\nu \log^{C+1} \varphi(T)}{\log(2)\min(1, C'(d, A, B))} \right\rceil + 1$$

intervals I such that $\Gamma_I(\mathbb{Q}, T)$ is contained in one algebraic curve of $\mathbb{R}^2$ of degree $\leq d$.

Proof. In case $x_0 \leq x_1 \leq \cdots \leq x_{n-1} \leq \varphi(T)$ we have.

$$x_n \geq x_0(1 + C'(d, A, B)\frac{T^{-\nu}}{\log^C \varphi(T)})^n.$$

Since by definition $x_{n(T)-1} \leq \varphi(T)$, we have

$$\varphi(T) \geq x_{n(T)-1} \geq x_0(1 + C'(d, A, B)\frac{T^{-\nu}}{\log^C \varphi(T)})^{n(T)-1}.$$

In particular

$$n(T) \leq \frac{\log \varphi(T) - \log x_0}{\log(1 + C'(d, A, B)T^{-\nu}/\log^C \varphi(T))} + 1.$$

In case $C'(d, A, B)T^{-\nu}/\log^C \varphi(T) \geq 1$, one has

$$n(T) \leq \frac{\log \varphi(T)}{\log 2} + 1 \leq \frac{T^\nu \log^{C+1} \varphi(T)}{\log 2} + 1.$$

The last bound in this double inequality is harmless, since we will see in Theorem 2.20 that the term T^ν is a constant for a good choice of d as a function of T. In case $C'(d, A, B)T^{-\nu}/\log^C \varphi(T) \leq 1$, by concavity of the log function we obtain

$$n(T) \leq \frac{T^\nu \log^{C+1} \varphi(T)}{\log(2)C'(d, A, B)} + 1. \qquad \square$$

Definition 2.18. We say that a curve $\Gamma \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ is **transcendental** if it contains no infinite real-algebraic set. In this situation, For $d \in \mathbb{N}^*$, let us assume that the number of points of $\Gamma_{[a,x]} \cap P^{-1}(0)$ is bounded by $\mathcal{B}(x,d)$, for $P \in \mathbb{R}[X,Y]$ any nonzero polynomial function of degree $\leq d$, and let us call such a function b a **Bézout bound for** Γ.

Notation 2.19. *For $x \in \mathbb{R}$, put $\log_+ x = \max(1, \log x)$.*

Theorem 2.20. *Let γ be a slow parametrization of a transcendental plane curve Γ, with height control function φ, and let $T \geq 1$. Then there exists a constant $\alpha = \alpha(A,B,C)$ such that*

$$\#\Gamma_{N(C),+\infty}(\mathbb{Q},T) \leq \alpha \log_+^{2(B+C)}(T) \log^{C+1}(\varphi(T)) \mathcal{B}(\varphi(T), \log_+ T),$$

where $N(C)$ is given by Proposition 2.12, and can for instance be e^C.

In particular Γ has finite order as soon as φ is polynomially bounded and $\mathcal{B}(x,d) \leq Q(\log x, d)$, for some polynomial Q, or as soon as $\varphi(T)$ is bounded by a power of $\log(T)$ and $\mathcal{B}(x,d) \leq Q(x,d)$, for some polynomial Q.

Proof. By Lemma 2.17, the numbers of intervals I we need to cover $[N(C), \varphi(T)]$, in such a way that $\Gamma_I(\mathbb{Q},T)$ is contained in one algebraic curve of degree at most d, is less than

$$\frac{T^\nu \log^{C+1} \varphi(T)}{\log(2) \min(1, C'(d,A,B))} + 1,$$

with

$$\frac{1}{C'(d,A,B)} = A \mu^B \mu^{2d/\mu} (\mu!)^{2/(\mu(\mu-1)}.$$

Thus, $\#\Gamma_{N(C,E),+\infty}(\mathbb{Q},T)$ is bounded by

$$\left(\frac{T^\nu \log^{C+1} \varphi(T)}{\log(2) \min(1, C'(d,A,B))} + 1 \right) \mathcal{B}(\varphi(T), d).$$

By Proposition 2.13, $\nu = \dfrac{4d}{\mu - 1} \leq \dfrac{8d}{(d+1)(d+2)-2} \leq \dfrac{8}{d}$. Taking

$$d = \lceil \log_+ T \rceil,$$

we find for instance $T^\nu \leq e^{16}$. Finally, let us bound each factor of $1/C'(d,A,B)$. We have, since $\frac{d^2}{2} \leq \mu \leq 2d^2$

$$\mu^B \leq 2^B (1 + \log_+ T)^{2B} \leq 2^B (1 + 1/\log 2)^{2B} \log_+^{2B} T.$$

$$\mu^{\frac{2d}{\mu}} = e^{\frac{4}{d} \log(2d^2)} \leq e^{12}.$$

$$(\mu!)^{\frac{2}{\mu(\mu-1)}} \leq \mu^{\frac{2}{(\mu-1)}} \leq e^{\frac{4 \log \mu}{\mu}} \leq e^{\frac{4}{e}}.$$

Now in case $\min(1, C'(d,A,B)) = 1$, we have that the number of intervals I we need to cover $[N(C), \varphi(T)]$ is bounded by $\alpha' \log^{C+1} \varphi(T)$, for some real number α'.

On the other hand, in case $\min(1, C'(d,A,B))$ is not 1, we have obtained as a bound $\alpha'' \log_+^{2(B+C)} T \log^{C+1} \varphi(T)$, for some real number α'' depending on our data A, B, C. In any case, one can take for a bound $\alpha \log_+^{2(B+C)} T \log^{C+1} \varphi(T)$, with $\alpha = \max(\alpha', \alpha'')$.

Assuming that φ is polynomially bounded and $\mathcal{B}(x,d) \leq P(\log x, d)$, for some polynomial $P \in \mathbb{R}[X,Y]$, one directly obtains that $\Gamma_{N(C),+\infty}$ has finite order. But since $\mathcal{B}(x,d) \leq P(\log x, d)$, one also deduces that $\Gamma_{[a,N(C)]}$ has finite order, by the same computation on $[a, N(C)]$, that reduces in the compact situation to the computation of [25] for mild parametrization.

□

Remark 2.21. The bound given for $\#\Gamma_{N(C),+\infty}(\mathbb{Q},T)$ in Theorem 2.20 is a product of two factors, one coming from the fast decay of the derivatives of the slow parametrization, the other one, $\mathcal{B}(\varphi(T), \log_+ T)$, depends on how much the curve intersects algebraic curves of degree $\lceil \log_+ T \rceil$ on the parameter interval $[N(C), \varphi(T)]$. Those two factors may behave independently. We know, by [26], [31] or [32], functions analytic on a neighbourhood of a compact interval having asymptotically as many as possible rational points of height less than T in their graph, (for instance, for $\epsilon \in]0,1[$, more than $\frac{1}{2}e^{2\log^{1-\epsilon} T}$ points, for an infinite sequence of values of T, whereas it has to be less than $C_\epsilon e^{\epsilon \log T}$ by [6] or [29]). Since the graph of a function analytic on a neighbourhood of a compact interval automatically inherits a mild parametrization, that is the compact version of our slow parametrization, it means that for those functions the second factor in our bound is as big as possible, while the first one stays bounded by a power of $\log T$. On the other hand for some families of curves Γ, one knows that Γ cuts algebraic curves of given degree in few points with respect to this degree, and in this case, the split form of the bound of $\#\Gamma_{N(C),+\infty}(\mathbb{Q},T)$ in Theorem 2.20 provides a small value.

Remark 2.22. Parametrizations γ with stronger decay than the decay φ_p of smooth parametrizations of Definition 2.2 provides better bounds for $\#\Gamma(\mathbb{Q},T)$. For instance, for some positive real number E and with the notation of Definition 2.2, one can consider parametrizations $\gamma = (f,g)$ such that g is slow and f satisfies for all $p \geq 0$

$$|\frac{(f-u)^{(p)}}{p!}(x)| \leq \frac{1}{x^E}\varphi_p(x). \tag{2.22.1}$$

In this case

- by Remark 2.15(3), when $u \in \mathbb{Q}$ one can take the height control function $\varphi(x) = T^{\frac{K}{E}}$ of γ, assuming that $f-u$ has no zero, and, by Remark 2.15(4), in case $u \notin \mathbb{Q}$ has a transcendence measure function $\tau(T)$ of the form $K \log T$, $K > 0$ (in particular when u is not a U-number of degree 1), one can take the height control function $\varphi(T) = T^{\frac{K}{E}}$ of γ.
- Since the decay of the derivatives of f is improved by condition (2.22.1), comparing to the case where f is simply slow, assuming condition (2.22.1), the same computations lead in Lemma 2.10 to a denominator $x^{p+E\alpha_1}$ instead of x^p, in Proposition 2.12 to a denominator $N^{\rho+E\frac{d^2}{2}}$ instead of N^ρ, and $N(C,E) = e^{\frac{C}{E}}$ instead of $N(C) = e^C$. As a consequence, in Theorem 2.20 we obtain a smaller factor $\log \varphi(T)$ instead of $\log^{C+1} \varphi(T)$.

3. Some Examples.

We apply in this section Theorem 2.20, the main statement of Section 2, which provides a bound for the number of rational points of prescribed height in a curve with slow parametrization γ and convenient height control function φ, as soon as we know a convenient Bézout bound $\mathcal{B}(x,d)$ for such a curve. In particular, we indicate how to obtain Proposition 1.1 by proving in detail a special case of Proposition 1.3, and similarly for Proposition 1.4.

3.1. **Around logarithmic spirals.** One typical family of oscillatory curves that Theorem 2.20 allows us to treat is the following family of fast logarithmic spirals. Let $\ell, q \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $F, G > 0$ and let

$$\phi_\ell := \frac{1}{x^F} \sin \circ \log^\ell(x), \quad \psi_q := \frac{1}{x^G} \cos \circ \log^q(x), \tag{3.1.1}$$

defined on some unbounded interval $[a, +\infty[$ in $\mathbb{R}_+^*$, with $a > 1$. Put $\gamma_{\ell,q} := (\phi_\ell, \psi_q)$. Observe that the image Γ of $\gamma_{\ell,q}$ is the same as that of

$$t \mapsto (e^{-Ft} \sin^d t, e^{-Gt} \cos^d t), \quad t \geq \log a.$$

The following two Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 will be used to prove in Lemma 3.4 that $\gamma_{\ell,q}$ is a slow parametrization of the curve Γ.

Lemma 3.2. *For any $\ell \geq 1$, for any $p \geq 1$ and for any $x \geq e$,*

$$\frac{(\log^\ell)^{(p)} x}{p!} \leq 2^\ell p^\ell \frac{\log^{\ell-1} x}{x^p}.$$

Proof. We use formula (2.9.1) with $f = 1$, $g = \log$ and $\beta = \ell$. We have

$$\frac{(\log^\ell)^{(p)} x}{p!} = \sum_{j_1 + \cdots + j_\ell = p} \frac{g^{(j_1)}(x) \cdots g^{(j_\ell)}(x)}{j_1! \cdots j_\ell!}.$$

Let us denote by k the number of indices $j_r \neq 0$ in the term $\frac{g^{(j_1)}(x) \cdots g^{(j_\ell)}(x)}{j_1! \cdots j_\ell!}$. Then this term is

$$\frac{\log^{\ell-k} x}{x^p j_1 \cdots j_\ell},$$

where only the non zero j_r's appear in the denominator. We then have, since $\log x \geq 1$,

$$\frac{(\log^\ell)^{(p)} x}{p!} \leq (p+1)^\ell \frac{\log^{\ell-1} x}{x^p} \leq 2^\ell p^\ell \frac{\log^{\ell-1} x}{x^p}$$

□

In the next Lemma, we use the following classical formula

$$\frac{(f \circ g)^{(p)}(x)}{p!} = \sum_{1m_1 + 2m_2 + \cdots + pm_p = p} \frac{f^{(m_1 + \cdots + m_p)}(g(x)) \prod_{j=1}^p (\frac{g^{(j)}(x)}{j!})^{m_j}}{m_1! \cdots m_p!} \tag{3.2.1}$$

Lemma 3.3. *Let f be a smooth function defined on $[d, +\infty[$, $d \in \mathbb{R}$ and assume that there exists α ($\alpha \geq 1$) such that for any $x \geq d$, for any $p \geq 0$, $|f^{(p)}(x)| \leq \alpha^p$.*

(1) Let $s \in S([e,+\infty[)$ with range in $[d,+\infty[$. Then $f \circ s \in S([e,+\infty[)$.
(2) For any $\ell \geq 1$, $f \circ \log^\ell \in S([e,+\infty[)$ and more accurately for any $p \geq 0$ and for any $x \geq e$ one has

$$\frac{|(f \circ \log^\ell)^{(p)}(x)|}{p!} \leq (\alpha 2^\ell)^p p^{(\ell+1)p} \frac{\log^{p(\ell-1)} x}{x^p}$$

Proof. (1) Let us denote A, B, C the constant attached to the slow function s. Note that $f \circ s$ is bounded (by 1), since so is f. By formula (3.2.1) one has for $p \geq 1$

$$|\frac{(f \circ s)^{(p)}(x)}{p!}| \leq \sum_{1m_1+2m_2+\cdots+pm_p=p} \alpha^p \prod_{j=1}^{p} A^{jm_j} j^{Bjm_j} \frac{\log^{Cjm_j} x}{x^{jm_j}}$$

$$\leq \alpha^p A^p p^{(B+1)p} \frac{\log^{Cp} x}{x^p}.$$

(2) One cannot use directly statement (1), since strictly speaking, $\log^\ell$ is not slow on $[e,+\infty[$, as it is not bounded, but nevertheless the computation made to prove (1) doesn't use the fact that s is bounded and shows that, for any $p \geq 1$, one has the bound announced in (2). Indeed by Lemma 3.2, we can take the constants $A = 2^\ell, B = \ell, C = \ell - 1$ for $(\log^\ell)^{(p)}/p!$ to satisfy the bound of Definition 2.2, for any $p \geq 1$. □

Lemma 3.4. *Let f, g be two smooth functions defined on $[d,+\infty[$, $d \in \mathbb{R}$ and $F, G > 0$. Assume that f and g are in the set of functions h satisfying*

$$h = Id \text{ or } \exists \alpha (\geq 1),\ \forall x \geq d,\ \forall p \geq 0,\ |h^{(p)}(x)| \leq \alpha^p.$$

Let s and σ be two slow functions on $[e,+\infty[$ with range in $[d,+\infty[$. Then, for $x \geq e$, the parametrization

$$x \mapsto (\frac{1}{x^F} f \circ s(x), \frac{1}{x^G} g \circ \sigma(x))$$

is a slow parametrization, satisfying condition (2.22.1) of Remark 2.22. In particular the parametrization $\gamma_{\ell,q} = (\phi_\ell, \psi_q)$ of (3.1.1) is a slow parametrization of the spiral $\gamma_{\ell,q}([e,+\infty[)$, satisfying condition (2.22.1), with height control function $\varphi(T) = T^{\frac{1}{\min(F,G)}}$.

Proof. The functions $h(x) = \frac{1}{x^F} f \circ s(x)$ and $k(x) = \frac{1}{x^G} g \circ \sigma(x)$ are slow since the functions $\frac{1}{x^F}$ and $\frac{1}{x^G}$ are slow, as well as $f \circ s$ and $g \circ \sigma$, by Lemma 3.3. It is then simple consequence of the chain rule that $h(x)$ and $k(x)$ satisfy condition (2.22.1) of Remark 2.22. Therefore, the following computation is given only in order to explicit the constants attached to the slowness of (h, k). We have by formula (2.9.1),

$$\frac{h^{(p)}(x)}{p!} = \sum_{i=0}^{p} \frac{1}{(p-i)!} (\frac{1}{x^F})^{(p-i)} \frac{1}{i!} (f \circ s)^{(i)}(x).$$

Observe that

$$\frac{1}{(p-i)!} (\frac{1}{x^F})^{(p-i)} \leq \frac{F}{1} \frac{F+1}{2} \cdots \frac{F+p-i-1}{p-i} \frac{1}{x^{F+p-i}} \leq \frac{1}{x^F} \frac{(F+1)^{p-i}}{x^{p-i}}.$$

It follows, by Lemma 3.3, that for any $x \geq e$, denoting again A, B, C the constants attached to the slow function s,

$$|\frac{h^{(p)}(x)}{p!}| \leq \sum_{i=0}^{p} \frac{1}{x^F} \frac{(F+1)^{p-i}}{x^{p-i}} \alpha^i A^i i^{(B+1)i} \frac{\log^{iC} x}{x^i}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{x^F}(p+1)(F+1)^p \alpha^p A^p p^{(B+1)p} \frac{\log^{pC} x}{x^p}.$$

Since for $p \geq 1$, one has for instance $p+1 \leq 2^p$, one finally obtains

$$|\frac{h^{(p)}(x)}{p!}| \leq \frac{1}{x^F}\Big[2(F+1)\alpha A p^{B+1} \frac{\log^C x}{x}\Big]^p,$$

and in the same way, denoting a, b and c the constants attached to the slow function σ,

$$|\frac{k^{(p)}(x)}{p!}| \leq \frac{1}{x^G}\Big[2(G+1)\alpha a p^{b+1} \frac{\log^c x}{x}\Big]^p,$$

showing that (h, k) satisfies condition (2.22.1) of Remark 2.22, for the following set of four constants

$$2\alpha(\max\{F,G\}+1)\max\{A,a\},\ \max\{B,b\}+1,\ \max\{C,c\}$$

$$\text{and } E = \max\{F,G\}.$$

In particular, by Lemma 3.3, (ϕ_ℓ, ψ_q) satisfies condition (2.22.1) of Remark 2.22 for the constants

$$2\alpha(\max\{F,G\}+1)\max\{\ell,q\},\ \max\{\ell,q\}+1, \max\{\ell,q\}-1$$

$$\text{and } E = \max\{F,G\}.$$

By Remark 2.15(2), one can take $\varphi(T) = T^{\frac{1}{\min(F,G)}}$ for height control function. □

Let us now give an explicit possible value for the bound $\mathcal{B}(x,d)$ (defined in Theorem 2.20) relative to the slow parametrized spiral of (3.1.1).

We are searching for a bound $\mathcal{B}(L,d)$ for the number of solutions of

$$P(\frac{1}{x^F}\sin\circ\log^\ell x, \frac{1}{x^G}\cos\circ\log^q x),$$

for x in some subinterval of $[1,+\infty[$ of length less than L, and for $P \in \mathbb{R}[X,Y]$ of degree less than d. This amounts to bounding the number of solutions of

$$Q(x, \sin\circ\log^\ell(x), \cos\circ\log^q(x)) = 0,$$

for x in some subinterval of $[1,+\infty[$ of length less than L, and for $Q \in \mathbb{R}[X,Y,Z]$ of degree less than $d(F+G)$. This finally amounts to bounding the number of solutions of the system

$$Q(e^y, \sin(z), \cos(w)) = z - y^\ell = w - y^q = 0,$$

for y in some subinterval of $[1,+\infty[$ of length less than $\log L$, and for $Q \in \mathbb{R}[X,Y,Z]$ of degree less than $d(F+G)$. By the theorem in [22, §1.4], we obtain

$$\mathcal{B}(L,d) \leq 4d(F+G)\ell q(d(F+G)+\ell+q+2)^2(\lceil(\log L)/\pi)\rceil+1).$$

Note that by Gwoździewicz et al. [18, Lemma 3] or Benedetti and Risler [2, Lemma 4.2.6] we can dispose of the non-degeneracy hypothesis in the theorem of [22, §1.4] by bounding instead the number of solutions of the regular system

$$Q(e^y, \sin(z), \cos(w)) = \epsilon, z - y^\ell = w - y^q = 0,$$

for ϵ a regular value of $y \mapsto Q(e^y, \sin(y^\ell), \cos(y^q))$.

For an appropriate constant α', using the bound $\alpha' \log_+^4 T$ we just obtained for $\mathcal{B}(T^{\frac{1}{\min(F,G)}}, \log T)$ and using the constants attached to the slow parametrization (3.1.1) that we obtained at the end of the proof of Lemma 3.4, one sees by Theorem 2.20 and Remark 2.22, that for Γ the spiral parametrized by (3.1.1), one can state the following proposition.

Proposition 3.5. *Let $F, G > 0$, $\ell, q \in \mathbb{N}^*$ and $T \geq 1$. Then there exist $N = N(F, G, \ell, q)$ (we can take $N = e^{\frac{\max\{\ell,q\}-1}{\max(F,G)}}$) and constants $\alpha = \alpha(F, G, \ell, q)$ and β (we can take $\beta = 5 + 4\max\{\ell, q\}$) such that*

$$\#\Gamma_{N,+\infty}(\mathbb{Q}, T) \leq \alpha \log_+^\beta T,$$

for Γ the spiral parametrized by $\gamma_{\ell,q}(x) = (\frac{1}{x^F} \sin \circ \log^\ell(x), \frac{1}{x^G} \cos \circ \log^q(x))$.

Remark 3.6. In Proposition 3.5 we could replace the spiral parametrized by $\gamma_{\ell,q}$ by a transcendental curve Γ parametrized by

$$x \mapsto (u + \frac{1}{x^F} f \circ s(x), v + \frac{1}{x^G} g \circ \sigma(x)),$$

where $F, G > 0$, $u, v \in \mathbb{R}$ and

- f and g are in the set of functions h satisfying
$$h = Id \text{ or } \exists \alpha (\geq 1),\ \forall x \geq d,\ \forall p \geq 0,\ |h^{(p)}(x)| \leq \alpha^p.$$
- f, g, s and σ are elementary functions in the sense of [22, §1.5] (defined from the simple functions e^x, $\sin x$, $\cos x$, $\log x$, $\arcsin x$, $\arccos x$, $\tan x$, $\arctan x$ and rational functions, by induction using composition),
- s and σ are compositions of slow functions, respectively with $\log^\ell$ and $\log^q$, for some $\ell, q \in \mathbb{N}^*$,
- one of the following conditions on u and v is satisfied
  (1) $u \in \mathbb{Q}$ and f does not vanished,
  (2) $v \in \mathbb{Q}$ and g does not vanished,
  (3) u and v are both rational,
  (4) $u \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and u is not a U-number of degree $\nu = 1$ in Mahler's classification,
  (5) $v \notin \mathbb{Q}$ and v is not a U-number of degree $\nu = 1$ in Mahler's classification,

In this situation, on one hand this parametrization is slow by Lemma 3.4, and on the other hand, by the theorem of [22, §1.6], $\mathcal{B}(L, d)$ is polynomially bounded in d and in $\log_+ L$. Furthemore by Remarks 2.15 any condition (1), (2), (3) or (4) on u and v insures that one can take for height control function of γ a power of T. Note that assuming condition (3) above, Remark 2.15(2) requires that $f \circ s$ and $g \circ \sigma$ have no common zero in order to have for height control function a power of T. But common zeroes of $f \circ s$ and $g \circ \sigma$ contributing only for the rational point (u, v), this

assumption is not necessary for Γ to have finite order. In conclusion, our assumptions on f, g, s, σ, u and v imply, in the same way that for Proposition 3.5, that Γ has finite order.

Note that functions f, g, s and σ satisfying the above conditions can be built using Remarks 2.6. For instance f and g can be built from the sin, cos, arctan and rational functions of negative degree, which are bounded elementary functions, and composition of those functions with elementary functions, in order to get elementary bounded functions. Functions in the algebra generated by bounded rational functions in $\log^r$, by $\sin \circ \log^\ell$, $\cos \circ \log^q$ and $\arctan \circ \log^m$, are instances of slow functions s and σ.

Proof of Propositions 1.1 and 1.3. The proof of Propositions 1.1 and 1.3 are straightforward, after reparametrization by log, since the assumptions of Proposition 1.1 are an axiomatization of the proof of Proposition 3.5, as made in Remark 3.6. Thus Remark 3.6 provides a compact interval J of the parameter outside which the curve of Proposition 1.1 have finite order. But for the piece of this curve parametrized by J, one can apply again our computation, that reduces in the compact case exactly to the computation of [25] through mild parametrizations. □

3.7. **The case of graphs.** We proceed here similarly as in the preceding section to establish Proposition 1.4 as a corollary of a detailed proof of a special case.

Given a function $g\colon J \to \mathbb{R}$ on some interval J of $\mathbb{R}$, we denote by Γ (or if needed Γ_g) the graph of g and for $I \subset J$, we denote by Γ_I (or $\Gamma_{g,I}$) the set $\Gamma \cap (I \times \mathbb{R})$.

We begin this section by remarking that the case of Γ (for g having controlled decay) is encompassed by the discussion of Section 2.

Actually for $g\colon [1, +\infty[\to \mathbb{R}$ satisfying the condition of Definition 2.2, the map $\gamma\colon [1, +\infty[\to \mathbb{R}^2$ defined by $\gamma(x) = (\frac{1}{x}, g(x))$ is a slow parametrization of a curve of $\mathbb{R}^2$, with rational points in bijective correspondence with rational points of same height in Γ. In fact γ satisfies condition (2.22.1) of Remark 2.22, hence as a consequence of Remark 2.22 and Theorem 2.20, we can state the following proposition.

Proposition 3.8. *Let $g\colon [a, +\infty[\to \mathbb{R}$ be a slow function with constants A, B and C. Assume that there exists some function $\varphi\colon [1, +\infty[\to \mathbb{R}$ such that the height of any rational point of $\Gamma_{\varphi(T),+\infty}$ is $\geq T$. Then there exist $N = N(C)$ (given by Proposition 2.12 and that can be for instance e^C) and a constant $\alpha = \alpha(A, B, C)$ such that*

$$\#\Gamma_{N,+\infty}(\mathbb{Q}, T) \leq \alpha \log_+^{2(B+C)} T \log(\varphi(T)) \mathcal{B}(\varphi(T), \log_+ T).$$

In particular, since one can always take $\varphi(T) = T$ by Remark 2.15(3),

$$\#\Gamma_{N,+\infty}(\mathbb{Q}, T) \leq \alpha \log_+^{2(B+C)+1} T \mathcal{B}(T, \log T).$$

Hence Γ has finite order as soon as there exists a polynomial Q such that $\mathcal{B}(x, d) \leq Q(\log x, d)$.

Remark 3.9. By the Lindemann-Weierstass theorem there is no rational point in the graph of sin (resp. log) excepted the point $(0, 0)$ (resp. $(1, 0)$), since for a nonzero algebraic number $x \in \mathbb{C}$, e^x has to be transcendental. A natural way to build functions from sin with graph having *a priori* the most chance to contain rational points is to compose sin with a function sending rational points to transcendental ones, such as

$x \mapsto rx$, for r a transcendental number or $x \mapsto \log^\ell x$, for $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^*$. Proposition 3.8 allows us to treat both cases.

In the first case, for the function $x \mapsto \sin(cx)$, $c \in \mathbb{R}_+^*$, restricted to a compact interval $[a - \frac{\pi}{2c}, a + \frac{\pi}{2c}]$, where $a \in \mathbb{R}$, the method of proofs of Section 2 applies, and reduces to the methods of [6] and [25] for analytic functions defined on compact intervals. In this situation, since [22, §1.4] provides $\alpha' \log^2 T$ as bound for the number of solutions of $P(x, \sin(cx)) = 0$, $x \in [a - \frac{\pi}{2c}, a + \frac{\pi}{2c}]$, $\deg(P) = \lceil \log_+ T \rceil$, we get a bound $\#\Gamma_{[a-\frac{\pi}{2c}, a+\frac{\pi}{2c}]} \leq \alpha'' \log_+^2 T$. Here the constant α'' does not depend on a, since we have uniform bounds for the derivatives of $x \mapsto \sin(cx)$ with respect to a, consequently for the graph Γ_c of $x \mapsto \sin(cx)$ we have

$$\#\Gamma_{c,\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q}, T) \leq \alpha c T \log_+^2 T.$$

Note that this bound is quite sharp, since $\#\Gamma_{\frac{\pi}{n},\mathbb{R}}(\mathbb{Q}, T)$ is bounded from below by $\frac{\alpha'''}{n} T$, for $T \geq n$.

The second case cannot be reduced to the compact case and uniform bounds for derivatives with respect to translations, and thus requires a control on the derivatives at infinity, as in the asumption of Proposition 3.8. We hereafter treat this case as a consequence of Proposition 3.8.

Corollary 3.10. *Let $\ell \in \mathbb{N}^*$, $g_\ell \colon \mathbb{R}_+^* \to \mathbb{R}$ be the function defined by $g_\ell(x) = \sin \circ \log^\ell(x)$ and let Γ_ℓ its graph. Then there exist constants $\alpha = \alpha_\ell$ and $\beta = \beta_\ell$ ($\beta = 5 + 4\ell$ being possible) such that for any $T \geq 1$,*

$$\Gamma_\ell(\mathbb{Q}, T) \leq \alpha \log_+^\beta T.$$

Proof. Using the theorem of [22, §1.4] in the same way that we did for Proposition 3.5, one obtains here, for the curve $\Gamma_\ell \cap ([1, T] \times \mathbb{R})$, the bound $\mathcal{B}(T, d) \leq 4d\ell(d + \ell + 2)^2(\lceil \frac{\log T}{\pi} \rceil + 1)$. Since by Lemma 3.4 the derivatives of g_ℓ satisfy the bound required by Proposition 3.8, one deduces from this proposition the existence of constants N, α and β, depending only on ℓ, such that

$$\#\Gamma_{\ell,[N,+\infty[}(\mathbb{Q}, T) \leq \alpha \log_+^\beta T.$$

Note that since $\mathcal{B}(T, \log T) \leq \alpha'_\ell \log^4 T$, for some $\alpha'_\ell > 0$, by Lemma 3.3 and by Proposition 3.8, $\beta = 5 + 4\ell$ is possible. Assuming that $N \geq 1$, note that over the interval $]0, 1/N]$ also a bound on the same kind holds since the one-to-one transformation $(x, y) \mapsto (1/x, -y)$ maps the rational points of height less than T of $\Gamma_{\ell,]0;1/N]}$ onto the rational points of height at most T of $\Gamma_{\ell,[N;+\infty)}$. Finally, over $[1/N, N]$, by [25], we also have the same kind of bound for $\#\Gamma_{\ell,[1/N,N]}(\mathbb{Q}, T)$ since $g_{\ell|[1/N,N]}$ is an analytic function on some compact domain and thus this graph comes with its obvious mild-parametrization (see the discussion after Theorem 1.5 in [25]).

□

Remark 3.11. More generally and similarly to Remark 3.6 and proof of Propositions 1.1 and 1.3, one can consider transcendental elementary functions defined in [22] that are given by composition of a slow function with some power of log (to have a Bézout bound $\mathcal{B}(x, d)$ as required in Proposition 3.8), in order to get instances of graphs with finite order. For instance, the graph of any coordinate of the curve of

Example 1.2 has finite order. In this way we get in particular a proof of Proposition 1.4. Concerning Proposition 1.4 as stated in the introduction, note that the function $af(c\log^\ell)$ is maybe not bounded by 1 in absolute value, as required by the definition slow functions, but then $af(c\log^\ell)/\lceil a+1\rceil$ is slow and finally if $\alpha\log^\beta T$ bounds $\#\Gamma_{\frac{af(c\log^\ell)}{\lceil a+1\rceil}}(\mathbb{Q},T)$ for some α,β, then $\alpha'\log^\beta T$ bounds $\#\Gamma_{af(c\log^\ell)}(\mathbb{Q},T)$, for some α'.

Remark 3.12. Similar results stating that the graph of some function has finite order have been recently proved, in particular for entire functions from $\mathbb{C}$ to $\mathbb{C}$ (see [7]), where Bézout estimates are provided by the growth of these functions, in the spirit of Coman and Poletsky [12]. In the real case since the growth of the derivatives is not prescribed by the growth of the function itself, one has to consider some bound for all the derivatives as an assumption. For instances of functions with graph of finite order (over a compact interval), see [13], where indeed the assumptions concern the Taylor coefficients at some point of the series.

Remark 3.13. When one comes to count rational points in graphs, a classical function to look at is the Riemann zeta function $\zeta\colon]1,+\infty[\to\mathbb{R}$, given by $\zeta(x)=\sum_{n=1}^{+\infty}\frac{1}{n^x}$. Let us denote Γ_ζ its graph. Note that by van den Dries and Speissegger [16], Γ_ζ is o-minimal, and that at first sight, by [29], $\#\Gamma_\zeta(\mathbb{Q},T)$ is at least subject, for any $\epsilon>0$, to a bound of the form $C_\epsilon T^\epsilon$. Moreover, it is known since [23] that for some constant $\alpha>0$

$$\#\Gamma_{\zeta,]2,3[}(\mathbb{Q},T)\leq\alpha\frac{\log^2 T}{\log^2\log T}.$$

The interval $]2,3[$ may be replaced by any bounded interval, as proved in [3]. In [8] it is finally proved that one can bound $\#\Gamma_{\zeta,]1,+\infty[}(\mathbb{Q},T)$ (as well as the number of algebraic points of height $\leq T$ and transcendence degree $\leq k$ over $\mathbb{Q}$) in the following way: for some constant $\alpha>0$,

$$\#\Gamma_{\zeta,]1,+\infty[}(\mathbb{Q},T)\leq\alpha\log^3(T)\log^3\log T.$$

It is indicated in [8, page 1154] that one can even get a $\log^2(T)\log^2\log T$ bound. We can here easily give a bound in the form $\log^4(T)\log\log T$ as a consequence of Proposition 3.8.

Another classical special function that can be treated by our approach is the Euler Γ function defined by $\Gamma(x)=\displaystyle\int_0^{+\infty}t^{x-1}e^{-t}\,dt$, considered for $x\geq 1$. Let Γ_Γ be the graph of this function. As for the Riemann zeta function, Γ_Γ is o-minimal (again see [16]). It has been proved in [4] that for any interval I of length 1,

$$\#\Gamma_{\Gamma,I}(\mathbb{Q},T)\leq\alpha\frac{\log^2 T}{\log\log T},$$

and in [8] the following bound is in particular given

$$\#\Gamma_{\Gamma,]0,+\infty[}\leq\alpha\log^2(T)\log^3\log T.$$

We give here a very rough bound of the form $\log^{11}(T)\log\log T$ as a direct application of Proposition 3.8.

For the special functions ζ and Γ our bounds have no better exponents then the best known exponents. But be aware that anyway no rational points are expected, or at least known, in the graph of these functions, except for $(n, n!)$, $n \in \mathbb{N}^*$, for Γ. Therefore even a small bound of type $\alpha \log^\beta T$ is probably very far from being realistic. Note that by [12, Theorem 8.2], the Bézout estimate that we shall use for ζ is quite sharp. This simply shows that any existing general method based on Bézout estimate is probably not appropriate in this case.

We just here produce bounds in order to show that our method works for those particular instances of functions, viewed as real ones, and how it can be adapted for the Euler function, since this function is not slow. We try to present the shorter computations in this aim, that are probably not the sharpest that one can get.

3.13.1. *The case of the Riemann ζ function.* First of all, we observe that the derivatives of ζ satisfies the bound of Proposition 3.8 on any interval $[a, +\infty[\subset]1, +\infty[$, for some $A = A_a, B = 1$ and $C = 0$. Indeed, we have on one hand for $p \geq 0$, $\zeta^{(p)} = \sum_{n\geq 1} (-1)^p \frac{\log^p n}{n^x}$. On the other hand, since the study of $x \mapsto \frac{x^p}{n^x}$ shows that $\frac{1}{n^x} \leq \frac{p^p}{e^p x^p \log^p n}$, for any $a > 1$ one can choose $\lambda = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{2a} \in]0, 1[$, such that for any $x \geq a$, $p \geq 1$

$$|\zeta^{(p)}(x)| \leq \sum_{n\geq 1} \frac{\log^p n}{n^{\lambda x}} \frac{1}{n^{(1-\lambda)x}} \leq \frac{p^p}{(\lambda e)^p x^p} \zeta((1-\lambda)x)$$

$$\leq \frac{p^p}{(\lambda e)^p x^p} \zeta(\frac{a}{2} + \frac{1}{2}) \leq \Big(\frac{\zeta(\frac{a}{2} + \frac{1}{2})}{\lambda e}\Big)^p \frac{p^p}{x^p}.$$

Then observe that, with the same λ as above and the notation $m_a = \zeta(\frac{a}{2} + \frac{1}{2}) - 1$, for ζ one can take for height function control

$$\varphi(T) = \frac{\log(m_a T)}{\lambda \log 2}. \tag{3.13.1}$$

This follows from the following remarks. In case $\zeta(x) \in \mathbb{Q}$ as height less than T, $T \geq 1$, then $\zeta(x) - 1 \geq \frac{1}{T}$. But for any $x \in [a, +\infty[$, one has

$$\zeta(x) - 1 \leq \sum_{n\geq 2} \frac{1}{n^{\lambda x}} \frac{1}{n^{(1-\lambda)x}} \leq m_a 2^{-\lambda x}.$$

Consequently for $x \geq \frac{\log(m_a T)}{\lambda \log 2}$, $\zeta(x)$ cannot have height less then T.

Finally, by [12, Theorem 8.2] or [23, Proposition 1], one knows that for some constant $c > 0$,

$$\mathcal{B}(\varphi(T), \log T) \leq c(\log(T) + \varphi(T) \log \varphi(T)) \log T. \tag{3.13.2}$$

From (3.13.1), (3.13.2) and Proposition 3.8 we deduce that for any $a > 1$, for any $T \geq 3$

$$\Gamma_{\zeta,[a,+\infty[}(\mathbb{Q}, T) \leq \alpha \log^4(T) \log\log T.$$

Remark 3.14. For $a > 1$, on $[a, +\infty[$, ζ may be not bounded by 1, and thus on this interval ζ is not a slow function. But as already noticed in Remark 2.3, one can always divide ζ by some large enough integer M_a in order to fulfil the definition of slow functions, since when $\alpha \log^\beta T$ bounds $\#\Gamma_{\frac{\zeta}{M_a},[a,+\infty[}(\mathbb{Q}, T)$, $\alpha' \log^\beta T$ bounds $\#\Gamma_{\zeta,[a,+\infty[}(\mathbb{Q}, T)$.

Remark 3.15. For u, v two real numbers such that $u + v$ is an irrational that is not a U-number of degree 1, one deduces from the study above that the graph of $u + v\zeta$ has finite order on $[a, +\infty[$. Indeed, up to dividing by a large enough integer as observed in Remark 3.14 , one has that $u + v\zeta$ is slow. Furthermore a Bézout bound for ζ is also a Bézout bound for $u + v\zeta$. Finally, taking into account the form of the Bézout bound for ζ given in (3.13.2), to apply Proposition 3.8 it remains to prove that a height control function of the graph of $u + v\zeta$ is a power of $\log T$. For this, observe that on one hand

$$|u + v\zeta(x) - (u + v)| \leq |v| m_a 2^{-\lambda x},$$

and on the other hand, since a transcendence measure function for $u + v$ is of the form $K \log T$, $K > 0$, when $u + v\zeta(x)$ is a rational number of height $\leq T$

$$\frac{1}{T^K} \leq |u + v\zeta(x) - (u + v)|.$$

It follows that when $u + v\zeta(x)$ is a rational number of height $\leq T$, $\frac{1}{T^K} \leq |v| m_a 2^{-\lambda x}$, and thus $x \leq K' \log T$, for some $K' > 0$.

3.15.1. *The case of the Euler* Γ *function.* We first remark that since for any $p \geq 0$, since $\dfrac{\log^p t}{t} \leq (\dfrac{p}{e})^p$ and since $\Gamma^{(p)}(x) = \displaystyle\int_0^{+\infty} \log^p(t) t^{x-1} e^{-t}\, dt$, on has

$$\Gamma^{(p)}(x) \leq (\frac{p}{e})^p \Gamma(x+1) = (\frac{p}{e})^p x\Gamma(x). \tag{3.15.1}$$

Now let us denote by f the inverse function of Γ on $[1, +\infty[$, and $x = f(y)$. On can show by induction on $p \geq 1$ that $\dfrac{f^{(p)}(y)}{p!}$ is a sum of at most $p!$ terms of the form

$$c(\Gamma^{(j_1)}(x))^{m_1} \cdots (\Gamma^{(j_p)}(x))^{m_p} (\Gamma'(x))^{-k},$$

with $|c| \leq 2^{p-2}$, $k \in [0, 2p-1]$, $j_1, \cdots, j_p \in [2, p]$, $m_1 + \cdots + m_p \in [0, p-1]$, $-k + j_1 m_1 + \cdots + j_p m_p = -1$ and $-k + m_1 + \cdots + m_p = -p$. From this observation and from (3.15.1) one has for any $p \geq 1$ and any $y \geq 1$ and for a set J of indices m_i, j_r of cardinality less than $p!$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{f^{(p)}(y)}{p!} &\leq 2^p \sum_J (\frac{p}{e})^{\sum_{r=1}^p j_r m_r} (x\Gamma(x))^{\sum_{r=1}^p m_r} (\Gamma'(x))^{-k} \\
&\leq (\frac{2}{e^2})^p p^{2p} \sum_J (x\Gamma(x))^{\sum_{r=1}^p m_r} (\Gamma(x))^{-k} \\
&\leq p! (\frac{2}{e^2})^p p^{2p} (\frac{x}{\Gamma(x)})^p = (\frac{2}{e^2})^p p^{3p} (\frac{f(y)}{y})^p.
\end{aligned}$$

But since for some constant D, $\Gamma(x) \geq De^x$, for some constant $\delta > 0$, $\log y \geq \delta f(y)$, and finally, for any $p \geq 1$

$$|\frac{f^{(p)}(y)}{p!}| \leq (\frac{2}{\delta e^2})^p p^{3p} (\frac{\log y}{y})^p. \tag{3.15.2}$$

This does not exactly shows that f is slow, since f is not bounded. But, as already noticed in Remark 2.5, a direct computation using $f(y) \geq 1$, formula (3.2.1) and the inequality (3.15.2) shows that $1/f$ is slow, with constants $A = \frac{4}{\delta e^2}, B = 4, C = 1$. Note that

$$\#\Gamma_{\frac{1}{f},[1,T]}(\mathbb{Q},T) = \#\Gamma_{f,[1,T]}(\mathbb{Q},T)$$
$$= \#\Gamma_{\Gamma,[1,\Gamma^{-1}(T)]}(\mathbb{Q},T) = \#\Gamma_{\Gamma,[1,+\infty[}(\mathbb{Q},T).$$

In order to bound $\#\Gamma_{\frac{1}{f},[1,T]}(\mathbb{Q},T)$ using Proposition 3.8, we need to produce for $1/f$ a bound $b_{1/f}(T, \log T)$. But clearly it is enough to find a bound $b_\Gamma(\frac{\log T}{\delta}, \log T)$ for Γ, since again, $\log y \geq \delta f(y)$. Such a bound is provided by [4, Proposition 3.1] in the form

$$b_\Gamma(\frac{\log T}{\delta}, \log T) \leq c \log^2(T) \log\log T.$$

We conclude by Proposition 3.8 that

$$\#\Gamma_{\Gamma,[1,+\infty[}(\mathbb{Q},T) \leq \alpha \log^{11}(T) \log\log T.$$

4. Some connections to logic

In this section, the reader is assumed to be familiar with definability theory over the field of real numbers (see, e.g., van den Dries and Miller [15] for a brief introduction).

Given $E \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$, we let E^{trans} be the result of removing from E all connected semialgebraic subsets of positive dimension.

Let $\mathfrak{R}$ be a fixed, but arbitrary, expansion of the real field; "definable" means "definable with parameters" (unless indicated otherwise).

The seminal paper [29] established the possibility of obtaining uniform large-scale asymptotics on height bounds of definable sets. We recall the basic result:

Theorem 4.1 ([29, 1.8])**.** *If $\mathfrak{R}$ is o-minimal, then $\log(\#E^{\text{trans}}(\mathbb{Q},T)) = o(\log T)$ for every definable set E.*

It is known that this is the best possible statement in this generality (see [26], [31], [32] for information). Two questions arise naturally:

(A) To what extent is o-minimality necessary?
(B) Are there examples of $\mathfrak{R}$ such that E^{trans} has finite order for every definable set E?

There is a trivial answer to (B), because E^{trans} is finite if and only if E is semialgebraic, if and only E is definable in the real field. Thus, let us modify the question:

(B′) Are there examples of $\mathfrak{R}$ such that E^{trans} has finite order for every definable set E, and there is some definable S such that S^{trans} contains a compact set of positive topological dimension?

Recent work of Binyamini and Novikov [5] shows that $\mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{RE}}$ (the expansion of the real field by the restrictions of exp and sin to $[0,1]$) provides a positive answer to (B′). It is well known by now that $\mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{RE}}$ is o-minimal. Wilkie has conjectured that the expansion of the real field by exp (on all of $\mathbb{R}$) is another example; for more information on Wilkie's Conjecture and progress theretoward, see [5], [11], [20], [21], [25], [27], [28]. We have a conjecture of our own:

Conjecture. E^{trans} has finite order for each E definable in the expansion of $\mathbb{R}^{\mathrm{RE}}$ by any logarithmic spiral $\mathbb{S}_\omega$. (We regard our result that $\mathbb{S}_\omega$ has finite order as an encouraging first step.) A strictly (by Tychonievich [33]) weaker version: E^{trans} has finite order for each E definable in $(\mathbb{R},+,\cdot,\mathbb{S}_\omega)$. Weaker still: E^{trans} has finite order for each E $\emptyset$-definable in $(\mathbb{R},+,\cdot,\mathbb{S}_\omega)$.

As for question (A), there is an obvious necessary condition: If $\mathfrak{R}$ defines the set of integers, $\mathbb{Z}$, then we cannot have even $\#E^{\mathrm{trans}}(\mathbb{Q},T)=o(T)$ for every $\emptyset$-definable $E\subseteq\mathbb{R}$. We can do better:

Proposition 4.2. *The following are equivalent.*

(1) $\#E^{\mathrm{trans}}(\mathbb{Q},T)=o(T)$ *for every definable* $E\subseteq\mathbb{R}$.
(2) Every definable subset of $\mathbb{R}$ *either has interior or is nowhere dense.*
(3) $\log(\#E(\mathbb{Q},T))=o(\log T)$ *for every definable* $E\subseteq\mathbb{R}^n$ *such that no coordinate projection of* E *has interior.*

(And similarly with "definable" replaced by "$\emptyset$-definable".)

Proof. 1⇒2. Let $E\subseteq\mathbb{R}$ be definable and have no interior. Suppose to the contrary that E is dense in some nonempty open interval I; then $(I\cap E)^{\mathrm{trans}}=I\cap E$ and $(I\setminus E)^{\mathrm{trans}}=I\setminus E$, yielding $\#I(\mathbb{Q},T)=\#(I\cap E)(\mathbb{Q},T)+\#(I\setminus E)(\mathbb{Q},T)=o(T)$, which is clearly false.

2⇒3. By Hieronymi and Miller [19, 1.4], E has Assouad dimension zero (see [19, § 4] for the definition). Thus, given $\epsilon>0$ there exists $C>0$ such that for all $T>1$

$$\#E(\mathbb{Q},T)\leq \mathrm{net}_{1/T}(E\cap[-T,T]^n)\leq C\left(\frac{T}{1/T}\right)^{\epsilon/2}=CT^{\epsilon}.$$

Hence, $\log(\#E(\mathbb{Q},T))=o(\log T)$.

3⇒1. If $E\subseteq\mathbb{R}$, then $E^{\mathrm{trans}}\subseteq E\setminus\mathrm{int}(E)$; if E is definable, then so is $E\setminus\mathrm{int}(E)$. □

There are several classes of structures known to satisfy Condition 4.2.2 that are not o-minimal. It would take us too far afield to discuss them here, but see [19] and [24] for examples and references. Remarkably, the following questions seem to be open: Does Condition 4.2.2 imply that $\#E^{\mathrm{trans}}(\mathbb{Q},T)=O(\log T)$ for every $\emptyset$-definable $E\subseteq\mathbb{R}$? Does Condition 4.2.2 imply that $\log(\#E^{\mathrm{trans}}(\mathbb{Q},T))=o(\log T)$ for every definable set E (that is, that the conclusion of 4.1 holds)? If $E\subseteq\mathbb{R}^n$ is a boolean combination of open sets and $(\mathbb{R},+,\cdot,E)$ does not define $\mathbb{Z}$, is $\log(\#E^{\mathrm{trans}}(\mathbb{Q},T))=o(\log T)$?

References

[1] Baker, A. *Transcendental number theory.* Cambridge University Press, London-New York, 1975.
[2] Benedetti, R., and Risler, J.-J. *Real algebraic and semi-algebraic sets.* Actualités Mathématiques. [Current Mathematical Topics]. Hermann, Paris, 1990.

[3] Besson, E. *Sur le nombre de points rationnels de la fonction zêta de Riemann*. Mémoire de Master 2. École Normale Supérieure de Lyon, 2011.
[4] Besson, E. Points rationnels de la fonction gamma d'Euler. *Arch. Math. (Basel) 103*, 1 (2014), 61–73.
[5] Binyamini, G., and Novikov, D. Wilkie's conjecture for restricted elementary functions. *preprint arxiv:1605.04671,* (2016).
[6] Bombieri, E., and Pila, J. The number of integral points on arcs and ovals. *Duke Math. J. 59*, 2 (1989), 337–357.
[7] Boxall, G., and Jones, G. Rational values of entire functions of finite order. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, 22 (2015), 12251–12264.
[8] Boxall, G. J., and Jones, G. O. Algebraic values of certain analytic functions. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, 4 (2015), 1141–1158.
[9] Browning, T. D., Heath-Brown, D. R., and Salberger, P. Counting rational points on algebraic varieties. *Duke Math. J. 132*, 3 (2006), 545–578.
[10] Cijsouw, P. L. A transcendence measure for π. In *Transcendence theory: advances and applications (Proc. Conf., Univ. Cambridge, Cambridge, 1976)*. Academic Press, London, 1977, pp. 93–100.
[11] Cluckers, R., Pila, J., and Wilkie, A. Uniform parameterization of subanalytic sets and diophantine applications. *preprint arxiv:1605.05916,* (2016).
[12] Coman, D., and Poletsky, E. A. Transcendence measures and algebraic growth of entire functions. *Invent. Math. 170*, 1 (2007), 103–145.
[13] Comte, G., and Yomdin, Y. Zeroes and rational points of analytic functions. *preprint arxiv:1608.02455,* (2016).
[14] Dries, L. v. d. Dense pairs of o-minimal structures. *Fund. Math. 157*, 1 (1998), 61–78.
[15] Dries, L. v. d., and Miller, C. Geometric categories and o-minimal structures. *Duke Math. J. 84*, 2 (1996), 497–540.
[16] Dries, L. v. d., and Speissegger, P. The field of reals with multisummable series and the exponential function. *Proc. London Math. Soc. (3) 81*, 3 (2000), 513–565.
[17] Gromov, M. Entropy, homology and semialgebraic geometry. *Astérisque*, 145-146 (1987), 5, 225–240. Séminaire Bourbaki, Vol. 1985/86.
[18] Gwoździewicz, J., Kurdyka, K., and Parusiński, A. On the number of solutions of an algebraic equation on the curve $y = e^x + \sin x$, $x > 0$, and a consequence for o-minimal structures. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 127*, 4 (1999), 1057–1064.
[19] Hieronymi, P., and Miller, C. Metric dimensions and tameness in expansions of the real field. *preprint arxiv:1510.00964,* (2015).
[20] Jones, G. O., Miller, D. J., and Thomas, M. E. M. Mildness and the density of rational points on certain transcendental curves. *Notre Dame J. Form. Log. 52*, 1 (2011), 67–74.
[21] Jones, G. O., and Thomas, M. E. M. The density of algebraic points on certain Pfaffian surfaces. *Q. J. Math. 63*, 3 (2012), 637–651.
[22] Khovanskiĭ, A. G. *Fewnomials*, vol. 88 of *Translations of Mathematical Monographs*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 1991. Translated from the Russian by Smilka Zdravkovska.
[23] Masser, D. Rational values of the Riemann zeta function. *J. Number Theory 131*, 11 (2011), 2037–2046.
[24] Miller, C. Tameness in expansions of the real field. In *Logic Colloquium '01*, vol. 20 of *Lect. Notes Log.* Assoc. Symbol. Logic, Urbana, IL, 2005, pp. 281–316.
[25] Pila, J. Mild parameterization and the rational points of a Pfaff curve. *Comment. Math. Univ. St. Pauli 55*, 1 (2006), 1–8.
[26] Pila, J. Note on the rational points of a Pfaff curve. *Proc. Edinb. Math. Soc. (2) 49*, 2 (2006), 391–397.
[27] Pila, J. The density of rational points on a Pfaff curve. *Ann. Fac. Sci. Toulouse Math. (6) 16*, 3 (2007), 635–645.

[28] Pila, J. Counting rational points on a certain exponential-algebraic surface. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble) 60*, 2 (2010), 489–514.
[29] Pila, J., and Wilkie, A. J. The rational points of a definable set. *Duke Math. J. 133*, 3 (2006), 591–616.
[30] Roth, K. F. Rational approximations to algebraic numbers. *Mathematika 2* (1955), 1–20; corrigendum, 168.
[31] Surroca, A. Sur le nombre de points algébriques où une fonction analytique transcendante prend des valeurs algébriques. *C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 334*, 9 (2002), 721–725.
[32] Surroca, A. Valeurs algébriques de fonctions transcendantes. *Int. Math. Res. Not.* (2006), Art. ID 16834, 31.
[33] Tychonievich, M. A. The set of restricted complex exponents for expansions of the reals. *Notre Dame J. Form. Log. 53*, 2 (2012), 175–186.
[34] Yomdin, Y. Volume growth and entropy. *Israel J. Math. 57*, 3 (1987), 285–300.

Laboratoire de Mathématiques de l'Université de Savoie Mont Blanc, UMR CNRS 5127, Bâtiment Chablais, Campus scientifique, 73376 Le Bourget-du-Lac cedex, France
E-mail address: georges.comte@univ-savoie.fr
URL: http://gc83.perso.sfr.fr/

Department of Mathematics The Ohio State University 231 W. 18th Avenue Columbus, OH 43210
E-mail address: miller@math.osu.edu
URL: https://people.math.osu.edu/miller.1987/